KCL-PH-TH/2014-9

How well do we understand the thermal history of the Universe? Implications of the recent BICEP2 data

Mairi Sakellariadou*
Department of Physics, King's College London, University of London, Strand WC2R 2LS, London, U.K.

Applying Grand Unified Theories in the context of the early Universe, cosmic strings are an unavoidable partner of the inflaton field. To render such models compatible with the CMB temperature anisotropies, the inflationary scale has to be lower than the 2×10^{16} GeV value deduced from the tensor-to-scalar ratio announced from the BICEP2 collaboration. Some questions are consequently raised about our understanding of the thermal history of the Universe.

PACS numbers: 98.80.-k,98.80.Cq

arXiv:1403.6688v1 [astro-ph.CO] 26 Mar 2014

Accepting the validity of Grand Unified Theories (GUTs) leads to the conclusion that the Universe, in the earliest stages of its evolution, was hotter and consequently in a more symmetric state. Subsequently, in the expansion process (Hubble's law), its temperature dropped and the Universe underwent a series of phase transitions followed by spontaneous breakdown of symmetries. Topological defects could then been left as remnants. In the context of (local) gauge theories — global theories, being rather unphysical, will not be discussed here — cosmic strings [1–3] have always been considered as the only (local) topological defects compatible with the observed Universe.

To dilute any undesired topological defects — domain walls, monopoles or textures — a stage of cosmological inflation [4–6] is usually imposed. Such an inflationary era solves (by construction) the horizon and flatness problems, while as a bonus, it provides a mechanism for the origin of adiabatic Gaussian fluctuations, in consistency with the measured Cosmic Microwave Background (CMB) temperature anisotropies. Hence, cosmological inflation can account for the observed large-scale structure, within the framework of the theory of gravitational instability.

In this spirit, one has to examine defect formation within the series of phase transitions from a large GUT gauge group $\mathrm{G_{GUT}}$ down to the Standard Model (SM) group $\mathrm{G_{SM}} = \mathrm{SU(3)} \times \mathrm{SU(2)} \times \mathrm{U(1)}$, with $\mathrm{G_{SM}} \subset \mathrm{G_{GUT}}$, and then postulate an inflationary era at the end of the (last) formation of any undesired defect. Performing a rather exhaustive investigation, we have shown [7] that cosmic strings are generically formed at the end of hybrid inflation [8], which can be of an F-term or D-term type.

*mairi.sakellariadou@kcl.ac.uk

F-term inflation can be realised within a scheme

$$\mathrm{G_{GUT}} \xrightarrow{M_{\rm GUT}} \mathrm{H}_1 \xrightarrow[\Phi_+\Phi_-]{M_{\rm infl}} \mathrm{H}_2 \longrightarrow \mathrm{G_{SM}} \ , \qquad (1)$$

where Φ_+, Φ_- is a pair of GUT Higgs superfields in non-trivial complex conjugate representations, which lower the rank of the group by one unit when acquiring a non-zero vacuum expectation value. The inflationary stage takes place at the beginning of the symmetry breaking $\mathrm{H}_1 \xrightarrow{M_{\rm infl}} \mathrm{H}_2$, and is based on the globally supersymmetric renormalisable superpotential

$$W^{\rm F}_{\rm infl} = \kappa S(\Phi_+\Phi_- - M^2) \ , \qquad (2)$$

where S is a GUT gauge singlet left-handed superfield and κ, M are two constants (M has dimensions of mass) which can be taken positive with field redefinition.

D-term inflation can be implemented within supersymmetric GUTs, supergravity, or string theory, with the gauge symmetry being spontaneously broken by Fayet-Iliopoulos (FI) terms. It is realised within a scheme

$$\mathrm{G_{GUT}} \times \mathrm{U(1)} \xrightarrow{M_{\rm GUT}} \mathrm{H} \times \mathrm{U(1)} \xrightarrow[\Phi_+\Phi_-]{M_{\rm nfl}} \mathrm{H} \to \mathrm{G_{SM}} \ , \qquad (3)$$

and is based on the superpotential

$$W = \lambda S \Phi_+ \Phi_- \ , \qquad (4)$$

where S, Φ_+, Φ_- are three chiral superfields and λ is the superpotential coupling.

Hence, provided Grand Unified Theories is a valid hypothesis, cosmic strings are expected to be left behind, as relics of an earlier more symmetric phase. Their cosmological consequences — and therefore their observational fingerprints — are mainly based on their gravitational interactions, which essentially depend on their linear mass density $\mu \sim T_{\rm c}^2$ (with $T_{\rm c}$ denoting the temperature of the phase transition during which strings were formed), which is intimately related to the scale of inflation.

Switching gears and moving to M-theory, in which branes of various dimensions are embedded in a higher dimensional space, one can still build a (brane) inflationary scenario, as the outcome of brane interactions. Within IIB string theory there are two classes of brane inflation models: D3/D7 inflation [9–11][1] and brane-antibrane inflation with D3/$\overline{\rm D3}$ [13] being the most studied example. The former is a string realisation of D-term inflation, whilst the latter is a string realisation of F-term inflation. Such brane inflation models generically accommodate [14, 15] cosmic superstrings [16, 17], which will then play the rôle of their field theoretic analogues.

Assuming the validity of the above discussion, one would expect [18] that cosmic (super)strings are a legitimate partner of the inflaton field, both seeding the initial density fluctuations which lead to the measured CMB temperature anisotropies. Hence, one may consider [18]

$$C_\ell = \alpha C_\ell^{\rm I} + (1-\alpha) C_\ell^{\rm S} \ , \qquad (5)$$

where $C_\ell^{\rm I}$ and $C_\ell^{\rm S}$ stand for the (COBE normalised) Legendre coefficients due to adiabatic inflaton fluctuations and those stemming from a cosmic (super)string network, respectively; the coefficient α is a free parameter expressing the relative amplitude for the two contributions.

Such theoretical constructions have to be tested against observational data and astrophysical measurements, and this has been the aim of various studies, in particular with respect to the CMB data [19, 20]. Let us leave aside the precise predictions of a given model, and summarise the generic predictions of each class of models (strings, and inflation), which turn out to be intrinsically different for reasons which are known for about two decades.

Cosmic (super)string models lead to isocurvature density perturbations — the total density perturbation vanishes, whilst the density perturbation of individual particle species does not. More importantly, perturbations are generated continuously; they evolve according to inhomogeneous linear perturbation equations, with the energy momentum tensor of strings being determined by their non-linear evolution. The resulting angular power spectrum of temperature anisotropies is qualitatively different than the one obtained via adiabatic perturbations from an inflationary model. More precisely, one obtains a broad low peak instead of the distinct series of acoustic peaks. Moreover, string models predict generically non-Gaussianities in the CMB temperature spectrum.

The first year Planck data have been analysed [20] within the framework of ΛCDM cosmology for a simple adiabatic model with an extra string contribution expressed in terms of the fractional contribution, f_{10}, of strings to the CMB temperature spectrum at multipole $\ell = 10$. For an abelian-Higgs field theory model, the constraint turned out to be $f_{10} < 0.028$, or equivalently $G\mu_{\rm AH}/c^2 < 3.2 \times 10^{-7}$ [20]. Moreover, the Planck data impose severe constraints on any primordial non-Gaussianity [21].

The evident question is whether the theoretical models can be compatible with the observational data [22]. Considering one-loop radiative corrections to the scalar potential along the inflationary valley, the effective scalar potential for F-term inflation reads [23]

$$V_{\rm eff}^{\rm F}(|S|) = \kappa^2 M^4 \Big\{ 1 + \frac{\kappa^2 \mathcal{N}}{32\pi^2} \Big[2 \ln \frac{|S|^2 \kappa^2}{\Lambda^2} + (z+1)^2 \ln(1+z^{-1}) + (z-1)^2 \ln(1-z^{-1}) \Big] \Big\} \ , \qquad (6)$$

where Λ denotes a normalisation scale, $z = |S|^2/M^2 \equiv x$, and $\mathcal{N}$ stands for the dimensionality of the representations to which the fields ϕ_+, ϕ_- (scalar components of the superfields) belong. The coupling κ is related to the mass scale M, through

$$\frac{M}{M_{\rm Pl}} = \frac{\sqrt{N_{\rm Q} \mathcal{N}}\, \kappa}{2\, \pi\, y_{\rm Q}} \ , \qquad (7)$$

where

$$N_{\rm Q} = \frac{4\pi^2}{\kappa^2 \mathcal{N}} \frac{M^2}{M_{\rm Pl}^2}\, y_{\rm Q}^2 \quad , \quad y_{\rm Q}^2 = \int_1^{x_{\rm Q}^2} \frac{{\rm d}z}{z f(z)} \quad , \quad x_{\rm Q} = \frac{|S_{\rm Q}|}{M} \ ,$$

and

$$f(z) = (z+1)\ln(1+z^{-1}) + (z-1)\ln(1-z^{-1}) \ ,$$

Note that the index Q denotes the scale responsible for the quadrupole anisotropy in the CMB, given by [24]

$$\left(\frac{\delta T}{T} \right)_{\rm Q} \sim \Big\{ y_{\rm Q}^{-4} \left(\frac{\kappa^2 \mathcal{N}\, N_{\rm Q}}{32\pi^2} \right)^2 \times \Big[\frac{64 N_{\rm Q}}{45 \mathcal{N}} x_{\rm Q}^{-2} y_{\rm Q}^{-2} f^{-2}(x_Q^2) + \left(\frac{0.77\kappa}{\pi} \right)^2 + 324 \Big] \Big\}^{1/2} \ , \qquad (8)$$

where $(\delta T/T)_{\rm Q}$ is normalised to the Cosmic Background Explore (COBE) data [25].

The dimensionless coupling κ is subject to the gravitino constraint, and to the constraint imposed from the CMB data; the latter being much stronger [24]. Assuming $N_{\rm Q} = 60$, one obtains the inflationary scale M, which is proportional to the string mass scale, as a function of the superpotential coupling κ. Hence, for $\mathcal{N} = \mathbf{126}$ we obtain [2]

[1] It is worth noting the caveat discussed in Ref. [12].

[2] Note that for a small coupling κ the results depend slightly on

$$M(\kappa) \sim \left[1.1 \times 10^{16} + 6.3 \times 10^{14} \, \ln(\kappa)\right] \text{ GeV} \, . \quad (9)$$

Performing a similar analysis as in Ref. [24], but using Planck results, we get

$$M < 1.5 \times 10^{15} \text{ GeV} \, . \quad (10)$$

The recent BICEP2 data on the CMB polarisation B-mode are well-fit by a lensed-ΛCDM model with tensor-to-scalar ratio $r = 0.20^{+0.07}_{-0.05}$ [26], which corresponds to a high value for the inflationary scale of about 2×10^{16} GeV. Considering it at face value, there is an inconsistency with Eq. (10). The inflationary scale, deduced from the results of the BICEP2 experiment, can be only accommodated if the superpotential coupling is of order unity, a value which is already excluded from the (weak) gravitino constraint, $\kappa < 8 \times 10^{-3}$.

While for F-term inflation, one may attempt to claim that there are a few SSB schemes that avoid cosmic string formation at the end of hybrid inflation, this is clearly not the case for D-term inflation which requires the existence of a non-zero Fayet-Iliopoulos term ξ, which can be added to the Lagrangian only in the presence of a U(1) gauge symmetry. As a result, the U(1) symmetry breaking at the end of the inflationary phase implies the unambiguous formation of cosmic strings. Note also that D-term inflation has to be addressed [27, 28] within effective supergravity built upon superconformal field theory [29]. Compatibility between CMB temperature anisotropies and predictions of the mixed "inflation + string" models lead to constraints [28] on the superpotential coupling λ, for a given value of the gauge coupling g, with some (weak) dependence on the choice of the Kähler potential.

For minimal supergravity, the effective potential reads [24]

$$V_{\rm eff}^{\rm D} = \frac{g^2\xi^2}{2}\left\{1 + \frac{g^2}{16\pi^2}\left[2\ln\frac{\lambda^2|S|^2}{\Lambda^2}\exp\left(\frac{|S|^2}{M_{\rm Pl}^2}\right) + (z+1)^2\ln(1+z^{-1}) + (z-1)^2\ln(1-z^{-1})\right]\right\} \quad (11)$$

with

$$z = \frac{\lambda^2|S|^2}{g^2\xi}\exp\left(\frac{|S|^2}{M_{\rm Pl}^2}\right) \equiv x^2 \, .$$

The number of e-folds reads

$$N_{\rm Q} = \frac{2\pi^2}{g^2}\,\tilde{y}_{\rm Q}(x_{\rm Q},\lambda,\xi,g) \, , \quad (12)$$

with

$$\tilde{y}_{\rm Q}(x_{\rm Q},\lambda,\xi,g) = \int_1^{x_{\rm Q}^2} \frac{{\rm W}(z(g^2\xi)/(\lambda^2M_{\rm Pl}^2))}{z^2 f(z)[1+{\rm W}(z(g^2\xi)/(\lambda^2M_{\rm Pl}^2))]^2}\,{\rm d}z \, ,$$

and ${\rm W}(x)$ denoting the inverse of the function $F(x) = xe^x$. The quadrupole temperature anisotropy, which we normalise to the COBE data, is

$$\left(\frac{\delta T}{T}\right)_{\rm Q} \sim \frac{\xi}{M_{\rm Pl}^2}\left\{\frac{\pi^2}{90g^2}x_{\rm Q}^{-4}f^{-2}(x_{\rm Q}^2)\frac{W}{1+W} + \left(\frac{0.77g}{8\sqrt{2}\pi}\right)^2 + \left(\frac{9}{4}\right)^2\right\}^{1/2} , \quad (13)$$

where $W = W(x_{\rm Q}^2(g^2\xi)(\lambda^2M_{\rm Pl}^2)$. Note that the only unknown is ξ, for given values of g and λ.

Performing a similar analysis as in Ref. [28], we find that the Planck deduced CMB constraints imply

$$g \lesssim 10^{-2} \;\text{ and }\; \lambda \lesssim 3 \times 10^{-6} \, , \quad (14)$$

which can be expressed as a constraint on the mass scale

$$\sqrt{\xi} \lesssim 1.5 \times 10^{15} \text{ GeV} \, . \quad (15)$$

This limit is inconsistent with the BICEP2 results on the inflationary scale. Let us emphasise that computing the mass scale of symmetry breaking, given by $\sqrt{\xi}$, one finds that it increases with λ. Hence, to achieve compatibility with the inflationary scale set by BICEP2, one needs to increase the value of λ above the upper limit imposed from the CMB temperature anisotropies measurements.

We obtain a similar constraint on ξ (Eq. (15) above), when we consider non-minimal supergravity, by including higher order corrections in the Kähler potential, as well as supergravity with shift symmetry, performing an analysis along the lines of Ref. [27].

In an attempt to evade the CMB constraints, a D-term inflation model has been proposed [30] that leads to semi-local strings. However, similar CMB constraints [31] are also imposed to a semi-local string contribution to the temperature anisotropies.

In conclusion, there is an inconsistency between mixed "inflation + string" models and current experimental data. To render the models compatible with the constraints one should lower the string energy scale, a trick that is no longer possible given the GUT-scale inflationary energy implied from the BICEP2 measurements.

Turning to the brane inflationary models, one expects similar constraints on the cosmic superstring contribution to the CMB temperature anisotropies. This is due to the expected broad low peak, a generic characteristic of all models with *seeds*, defined as any non-uniformly distributed form of energy, which contributes only a small fraction to the total energy density of the Universe and which interacts with the cosmic fluid only gravitationally.

---

the choice of $\mathcal{N}$.

In short, combining the temperature anisotropies data with the results on the CMB polarisation B-modes, we unavoidably conclude that mixed "inflation + string" models face severe problems. But such models are the most realistic outcome of Grand Unified Theories applied in the context of the early Universe. Moreover, we have recently examined [32] whether F-term supersymmetric hybrid inflation can be (naturally) embedded within the minimal SO(10) model. We have shown [32] that none of the singlets of the Standard Model symmetries in the minimal set of SO(10) representations, can satisfy the necessary conditions for a scalar field to play the rôle of the inflaton. Let us also note that most probably this result is also valid for other gauge groups beyond SO(10).

It is therefore clear that we are missing some important elements in order to reassemble the puzzle of the early Universe evolution. It may be worth analysing the CMB data beyond the ΛCDM model, or further investigating inflationary models with a few e-folds after string formation [33].

[1] A. Vilenkin and P. Shellard, *Cosmic strings and other topological defects* (Cambridge University Press, 1994).

[2] M. Sakellariadou, Lect. Notes Phys. **718**, 247 (2007) [hep-th/0602276].

[3] M. Sakellariadou, Nucl. Phys. Proc. Suppl. **192-193**, 68 (2009) [arXiv:0902.0569 [hep-th]].

[4] A. A. Starobinsky, Phys. Lett. B **91**, 99 (1980).

[5] A. H. Guth, Phys. Rev. D **23**, 347 (1981). [33]

[6] A. D. Linde, Phys. Lett. B **108**, 389 (1982).

[7] R. Jeannerot, J. Rocher and M. Sakellariadou, Phys. Rev. D **68**, 103514 (2003) [hep-ph/0308134].

[8] A. D. Linde, Phys. Rev. D **49**, 748 (1994) [astro-ph/9307002].

[9] K. Dasgupta, C. Herdeiro, S. Hirano, R. Kallosh, Phys. Re[33]v. **D65**, 126002 (2002) [hep-th/0203019].

[10] K. Dasgupta, J. P. Hsu, R. Kallosh, A. D. Linde, M. Zagermann, JHEP **0408**, 030 (2004) [hep-th/0405247].

[11] R. Gwyn, M. Sakellariadou and S. Sypsas, JHEP **1010**, 075 (2010) [arXiv:1008.0087 [hep-th]].

[12] R. Gwyn, M. Sakellariadou and S. Sypsas, JHEP **1109**, 075 (2011) [arXiv:1105.1784 [hep-th]].

[13] S. Kachru, R. Kallosh, A. D. Linde, J. M. Maldacena, L. P. McAllister and S. P. Trivedi, JCAP **0310**, 013 (2003) [arXiv:hep-th/0308055].

[14] S. Sarangi and S. H. H. Tye, Phys. Lett. B **536**, 185 (2002) [hep-th/0204074].

[15] G. Dvali and A. Vilenkin, JCAP **0403**, 010 (2004) [hep-th/0312007].

[16] J. Polchinski, Int. J. Mod. Phys. A **20**, 3413 (2005) [AIP Conf. Proc. **743**, 331 (2005)] [hep-th/0410082].

[17] M. Sakellariadou, Phil. Trans. Roy. Soc. Lond. A **366**, 2881 (2008) [arXiv:0802.3379 [hep-th]].

[18] F. R. Bouchet, P. Peter, A. Riazuelo and M. Sakellariadou, Phys. Rev. D **65**, 021301 (2002) [astro-ph/0005022].

[19] P. A. R. Ade *et al.* [Planck Collaboration], arXiv:1303.5075 [astro-ph.CO].

[20] P. A. R. Ade *et al.* [Planck Collaboration], arXiv:1303.5085 [astro-ph.CO].

[21] P. A. R. Ade *et al.* [Planck Collaboration], arXiv:1303.5084 [astro-ph.CO].

[22] arXiv:1308.6666 [hep-th].

[23] G. Dvali, Q. Shafi, and R. Schaefer, Phys. Rev. Lett. **73**, 1886 (1994).

[24] J. Rocher and M. Sakellariadou, JCAP **0503**, 004 (2005) [hep-ph/0406120].

[25] C. L. Bennett, et. al. Astrophys. J. **464**, 1 (1996).

[26] P. A. R. Ade *et al.* [BICEP2 Collaboration], arXiv:1403.3985 [astro-ph.CO].

[27] J. Rocher and M. Sakellariadou, Phys. Rev. Lett. **94**, 011303 (2005) [hep-ph/0412143].

[28] J. Rocher and M. Sakellariadou, JCAP **0611**, 001 (2006) [hep-th/0607226].

[29] R. Kallosh, L. Kofman, A. D. Linde and A. Van Proeyen, Class. Quant. Grav. **17**, 4269 (2000) [Erratum-ibid. **21**, 5017 (2004)] [hep-th/0006179].

[30] J. Urrestilla, A. Achucarro and A. C. Davis, Phys. Rev. Lett. **92**, 251302 (2004) [hep-th/0402032].

[31] J. Urrestilla, N. Bevis, M. Hindmarsh, M. Kunz and A. R. Liddle, JCAP **0807**, 010 (2008) [arXiv:0711.1842 [astro-ph]].

[32] G. Cacciapaglia and M. Sakellariadou, Eur. Phys. J. C **74**, 2779 (2014) [arXiv:1306.3242 [hep-ph]].

[33] K. Kamada, Y. Miyamoto and J. 'i. Yokoyama, JCAP **1210**, 023 (2012) [arXiv:1204.3237 [astro-ph.CO]].